

hearings you may wish to contact Mr. Steven Quarles of the committee staff on 224-9894. Those wishing to testify or submit a written statement for the hearing record should write to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, room 3106, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARINGS BEFORE THE ENERGY RESEARCH AND WATER RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public, the cancellation of a public hearing before the Energy Research and Water Resources Subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

This hearing was to examine the Energy Research and Development Administration upon implementation of the Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act passed by the Congress last year.

Instead of conducting a hearing on solar energy and because of the urgency of the matter, a markup hearing on the ERDA authorization bill (S. 598), which has been referred to the Senate Interior Committee, has been scheduled for May 13, beginning at 10 a.m. in room 3110 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. This markup session will allow the subcommittee to address the nonnuclear portion of the ERDA budget request.

NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this is to announce to the Senators and other interested persons that a joint hearing will be held by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Subcommittee on Manpower, Compensation, Health and Safety of the Committee on Education and Labor on Jobs and Unemployment, Monday, May 19, 1975. The hearing will begin at 9:30 a.m. at Marist High School, 1241 Kennedy Boulevard, Bayonne, N.J. Interested persons who wish to testify or who wish to submit testimony to be included in the record should contact Mr. Donald E. Elisburg, General Counsel, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 224-7665.

NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this is to announce to the Senators and other interested persons that hearings on the nominations for the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation will be held by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on Wednesday, May 14, and Thursday, May 15. The hearings will begin at 9 a.m. in room 4232, Dirksen Senate Office Building. Interested persons who wish to testify or who wish to submit testimony to be included in the record should contact Donald Elisburg, General Counsel, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 224-7665.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON LOBBY REFORM

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Senate Committee on Government Operations will hold a second set of hearings on S. 774 and S. 815, lobby reform legislation, next Wednesday and Thursday, May 14 and 15.

The hearings will begin at 10 a.m. in room 3302 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The committee will hear from the following witnesses:

Wednesday, May 14: Milton A. Smith, general counsel, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Andrew Biemiller, legislative director, AFL-CIO.

Thursday, May 15: Harold R. Tyler, Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice; and Richard D. Godown, senior vice president and general counsel, National Association of Manufacturers.

Anyone wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may write the Senate Committee on Government Operations, room 3306, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510. Phone 224-4751.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REVENUE SHARING RENEWAL

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, last week renewal of revenue sharing was introduced in the Senate. Though I do not support every detail of the President's bill, I remain a firm supporter of general revenue sharing. For that reason, I am today joining as a cosponsor of S. 1625.

Four years ago the 92d Congress debated the merits of enacting a general revenue-sharing program to provide a new form of financial assistance to revenue-starved State and local governments. As a longtime supporter of revenue sharing, I understood the program's goals at that time to be quite simple. They were:

One. To relieve the fiscal problems of hard-pressed local governments with inadequate or inflexible tax bases.

Two. To reduce the regressive burden of State and local taxes by substituting revenues from progressive Federal income taxes; and

Three. To give people at the State and local levels the resources and the flexibility to develop solutions suited to their unique problems.

General revenue sharing is not—nor was it ever intended to be—a substitute for carefully targeted categorical programs aimed at specific social problems. The proper role for revenue sharing is—and should remain—that of a complement—not a substitute—for a balanced mix of general revenue sharing, block grants, and categorical programs.

As the 94th Congress begins to assess the impact of general revenue sharing, it would be helpful if both its critics and supporters returned to these relatively modest but extremely meaningful goals. When measured by this limited test, I believe the success column for revenue

sharing is longer than its critics would have us believe.

In most cases, revenue-sharing funds have gone into worthwhile programs. Hot lunches for the elderly, improved police protection, and new sewage treatment facilities are some of the successes.

In many other instances, State and local taxes have been held down because of revenue sharing. And I might add that in many of our urban areas, holding down property taxes is a worthy social objective.

That is not to say that the first revenue sharing program has been an unqualified success, or that there are not problems that have cropped up. As the 94th Congress considers extending the present program beyond 1976, it faces some tough choices. Some of those choices are necessary because of the flaws that have become evident in the program's first 3 years of operation. Others are choices that should have been made before revenue sharing was ever enacted, but which were avoided in the spirit of compromise deemed necessary to get any program at all in 1972.

Perhaps the most difficult question of all is: it makes sense, or if we can afford, to give something to everybody under revenue sharing, whether they need it or not. That is what we did in 1972, in order to get a bill.

Personally do not think it does make sense, and I do not think we can afford, to give revenue sharing money to certain units of government simply because they exist, but serve no substantial governmental function. I do not think it makes sense, nor do I think we can afford, to give money to affluent communities with no demonstrated need for assistance, while big cities with big problems have arbitrary limits imposed on the amount they receive.

So our first tough choice must be to rewrite the revenue sharing formula to insure that greater emphasis is placed on need.

We need to raise or eliminate the ceiling that holds down payments to cities, relative to other communities in the same State. We must find a better way to judge the amount all governments should receive, and adjust the formula where it deprives cities of needed funds because they are located in relatively affluent States. At the same time, we need to revise the current 20-percent floor where it benefits wealthy communities or governments with very limited functions.

A second difficult question facing the Congress in renewing revenue sharing is the matter of incentives for tax reform at the State and local levels.

To be sure, tying tax reform to revenue sharing is not going to be popular with many people. But we must consider the argument of critics that revenue sharing has actually shored up regressive State and local tax systems. For every time a local government has been able to cut property taxes because of revenue sharing, the pressure for reform is weakened.

A third major focus of the revenue

sharing debate this year must be on improved civil rights enforcement. The problem here is not one we avoided during the original debate, but one which has reappeared in the administration of the present program.

In our upcoming efforts to enact revenue sharing renewal, we must make it very clear that simply because the funds are free, they are not a blank check to discriminate. We must also assure that the Office of Revenue Sharing has the staff to enforce the law.

And we must also assure for local citizens the opportunity to participate more fully in decisions about how revenue sharing money will be used.

In presenting its recommendations for revenue-sharing renewal, the administration has addressed some—but not all—of these important questions. I am co-sponsoring S. 1625, the administration's bill, because I share its assessment that general revenue sharing has been an important shot in the arm for our Federal system. I do so—not in the belief that S. 1625 is the final answer in our efforts to build upon the strengths and iron out the flaws of the current program—but in the belief that the legislation can be improved and strengthened by constructive debate.

VIETNAMESE REFUGEES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I support the actions of President Ford directed at taking care of the Vietnamese refugees who have come to our shores seeking the freedom and the care and compassion for fellow man that is our heritage as Americans.

I am shocked and baffled at the anti-refugee attitude being expressed by some people whose ancestors were immigrants at one time. Letters arriving at congressional offices are signed by people with "foreign" names, people who are proud to call themselves American but whose surnames clearly depict the their national origins. These people are also proud of their ancestral backgrounds, and rightly so, since they have contributed to this great "melting pot" our young people are reading about in their history books.

Is the "melting pot" concept past history?

Are we now ready to deny our own immigrant backgrounds, to refuse the welcome and the compassion that greeted our ancestors when they came to this country seeking a better life, seeking the kind of life America is supposed to be all about?

We must remember that inscription on the Statue of Liberty, "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free. . . ." They are not meaningless words that have no support from people whose hearts have turned to stone like the statue itself. I am sure of this.

And for this reason, I do not understand the reports that vast numbers of Americans are opposed to receiving any Vietnamese refugees in our country. As President Ford so aptly stated, these reports do not typify the America I know. They must represent a bad sampling of opin-

ion. I believe that the majority of Americans agree with the President.

I do understand the logical concerns. We are in a period of high unemployment. We are in a period of high inflation, high welfare, long food stamp lines. And, of course, we are concerned about taking care of our own people who face these very real problems.

But no one said that the final end to Vietnam would be easy.

There is no way to plan a war to end when it is most convenient for your economy to absorb an influx of refugees.

I was in Congress when thousands of Hungarians were offered refuge and comfort here. Following World War II, we took in the largest number of refugees ever. When Cuba collapsed, I was in Congress to see this country welcome hundreds of thousands of persons who preferred freedom to communism.

I cannot bear to see this Congress or this country turn its back on a people who have come to us for help now. Would we have wanted our ancestors to be treated that way?

The Vietnamese who are coming to our country, and who are already here, are largely middle-class, hard-working people like ourselves. Many of them have professional skills that will benefit our economy. The South Vietnamese are industrious, family-oriented and freedom-loving.

They do not come to take jobs away from our people. They come to seek the freedom we fought for in their country, could not win, and should be happy to offer them now. They have left their homeland. Many families have split up.

They will be paying the price of war all their lives.

If this country turns its back on them now, we may as well go out and sink the Statue of Liberty. It says, "Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me. . . ."

If we do not mean that any more, then how can we honestly say we were fighting for freedom in the first place?

V-E DAY—VICTORY IN EUROPE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, today, we celebrate the 30th anniversary of the end of the war in Europe: V-E Day—Victory in Europe. It is ironic, perhaps, that the victory over Nazism and the liberation of Europe came just three decades to the week before the end of the Vietnam war. These 30 years span two generations of American involvement in the outside world; they bound an era in our foreign relations.

The coincidence of these two events is important for a particular reason: for as we put the Vietnam experience behind us, we are challenged to regain perspective on the world and our place in it; we are challenged to reaffirm our commitment to truly vital interests; we are challenged to build upon cooperative relations with those countries most important for us and for the future of the world.

So as the Indochina war ends, we return to our concern for the future of Europe. The contrast with May 7, 1945 is staggering. In ruins following man-

kind's most devastating war, Europe then seemed almost beyond salvation. Once great nations—friend and foe—lay prostrate. The Continent was crying out for help in building shattered economies and broken lives. And the seeds of cold war had already been sown.

Thirty years later, the shape of the Continent has radically changed. Recovery from the ravages of war is complete. The European Community is a hopeful effort in relations between states that go beyond the rivalries of the past—that look toward new institutions for the future. The Community has achieved economic power second only to that of the United States. In Western Europe, there has been a resurgence of political strength and democratic values, and deep dedication to human freedoms—in countries we fought against in World War II as well as in those Western countries that joined us in the crusade in Europe.

Meanwhile, we have gone through the dark night of the cold war, and are now concerned with settling the issues of the past, with promoting détente, and with reconciling nations of a divided Continent.

Today, as we turn from our preoccupation with Indochina, our task in Europe is clear:

We must reaffirm the preeminent place that this continent—and the Western alliance—play in U.S. interests and concerns;

We must reaffirm the importance of the NATO alliance, and the military security upon which our hopes for détente are based;

And we must redouble our efforts to work with the nations of Europe—especially our friends and allies in the West—on meeting economic problems peculiar to industrial states, and the new global problems of food, fuel, raw materials, and the workings of the international economic system.

These are all important and critical items on the agenda for American leadership and action in the months and years ahead:

We are particularly concerned with reviving the strength and vitality of the Western alliance. Beyond a renewal of our military and political commitment to Europe, this means in particular a steadfast concern with the economic bonds of alliance. There is a pressing need for real reform of the international economic system, in which the industrial states of the West play a central role. We are now about to enter a new round of trade negotiations, which will set the pattern of trade relations for many years to come. And there is still the critical problem of energy—where, unfortunately, there is now less momentum following a brief creative period at the end of last year.

Yet the test of Atlantic cooperation in the near future will come in this vital area. There was a high degree of common effort during the recent energy conference in Paris; but far more needs to be done, before we can genuinely say that there is forward-looking, productive response in common to the energy challenge.